

2545 S. Birmingham Pl.  
Tulsa OK 74114  
8 September 2001

550481

Carol Hanlon, DOE  
Yucca Mountain Site Characterization Office (M/S #925)  
PO Box 30307  
North Las Vegas, NV 89036-0307

RECEIVED

SEP 14 2001

Dear Ms. Hanlon:

I am writing to express my deep concern over the Yucca Mountain Project. I disapprove strongly of the faulty process which seems to be railroading the project toward approval. How can the Secretary of Energy be preparing to recommend Yucca Mountain for a high-level nuclear waste dump when thousands of public comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement still have not been addressed?

It is not only a Final Environmental Impact Statement which is missing, but also a detailed transportation scenario. The 70,000 metric tons of high-level radioactive waste which the DOE is attempting to sweep under the rug, as it were, will be an even worse problem than now if it is moved all over the country enroute to Yucca Mountain. How is the waste to be transported? This DOES make a difference!!! I know that the casks are not ready. Our railroad lines are unsafe. I live in a state which is likely to bear a very unfair burden of the transportation hazards. If the waste is trucked across Oklahoma on our present highway system, for example, it will pass near countless homes and schools (not to mention workplaces). Is a separate, protected, highway system to be built? (Will emergency response teams all along the transportation routes be prepared? In the normal course of events, it is local teams which arrive first at an accident site. How in the world can every mile of every route be covered by trained personnel? Perhaps the DOE will train a separate "elite" corps of emergency personnel? Will they be volunteers, or drafted?)

It makes no sense for the DOE to wring its hands about its "obligation for the final disposition of high-level radioactive waste" and to pretend that the Yucca Mountain Project is an answer. The Yucca Mountain Project is an exacerbation of the problem! The Project could result in the final disposition (destruction) of the health, safety and freedom of 50 million Americans, if not the whole country.

What about finalized Siting Guidelines or a licensing rule? The DOE really lacks the basis for consideration of site suitability. The public cannot have confidence in such a defective process.

Additionally, I believe it relevant to mention that the Department of Energy seems to be intending to proceed with the Yucca Mountain Project no matter how much juggling it has to do with science, particularly with radiation protection standards. Is "science" being asked to ignore the seismic character of the site? Is "science" being called upon to pretend that there is no aquifer under the site? Once radioactivity enters the water, you know there is no containing it.

The fact that the DOE has spent 20 years and over \$6.7 billion studying various means to "dispose" of the waste is proof to me of some backwards thinking. The burden of waste should not have not been allowed to increase until a safe way to deal with it had been found. Obviously, the burden **should not now be allowed to increase**, and all the talk and paper and money devoted to the flawed Yucca Mountain Project simply constitute a dangerous distraction from the fact that the burden IS GROWING.

Of course I don't believe the Secretary of Energy should recommend to the President that Yucca Mountain be developed to serve as our "repository" for the waste. Of course I don't think the President should conclude that the Yucca Mountain site is qualified for the preparation and submission of a construction license application to the NRC!!! That would be preposterous. I urge you to abandon the Yucca Mountain Project.

Yours truly,  
B. Geary

cc. The Honorable Don Nickles, The Honorable James Inhofe, The Honorable Steve Largent (US Congress)